



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,891	03/31/2006	Tatsuo Hoshino	21421 US C038435/0185661	4642
7590 05/07/2008				
Stephen M Haracz Bryan Cave 1290 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10104-3300			EXAMINER FRONDA, CHRISTIAN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1652	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,891

Applicant(s)

HOSHINO ET AL.

Examiner

CHRISTIAN L. FRONDA

Art Unit

1652

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 and 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 and 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, and 6-8 are pending and under consideration in this Office Action. The amendment filed 03/31/2008 has been considered and entered. The finality of the previous Office Action has been withdrawn.

The previous rejections and objections have been withdrawn. New rejections and new grounds of rejection are presented in the instant Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

According to MPEP 2143:

“Exemplary rationales that may support a conclusion of obviousness include:

(A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;

(B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;

(C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;

(D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;

(E) “Obvious to try” – choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;

(F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;

(G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

Note that the list of rationales provided is not intended to be an all-inclusive list. Other rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness may be relied upon by Office personnel.”

3. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao et al. (J Bacteriol. 1995 May;177(10):2804-12; PTO 892) in view of the combined teachings of Sprenger et al. (Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1997 Nov 25;94(24):12857-62; PTO 892) and Laber et al. (FEBS Lett. 1999 Apr 16;449(1):45-8; PTO 892).

Zhao et al. teach a recombinant *Escherichia coli* capable of producing vitamin B6 comprising extra nucleic acids from *Escherichia coli* (*epd* gene) encoding erythrose 4-phosphate dehydrogenase, which is expected to be amplified using the recited PCR primers of SEQ ID NOs: 1 and 2. See entire publication, especially pages 2804-2810, Figs. 1 and 2, and Tables 1-3. The teachings of Zhou et al. differ from the claims in that the recombinant *Escherichia coli* does not carry extra nucleic acids encoding 1-deoxy-D-xylulose 5-phosphate synthase and pyridoxol 5'-phosphate synthase.

Sprenger et al. teach the nucleic acid from *Escherichia coli* encoding 1-deoxy-D-xylulose 5-phosphate synthase, which is required for the formation of the 1-deoxy-D-xylulose 5-phosphate precursor to vitamin B6 and is expected to be amplified using the recited PCR primers of SEQ ID NOs: 5 and 6. See entire publication, especially pages 12857-12861 and Figs. 1-4.

Laber et al. teach the nucleic acid from *Escherichia coli* encoding pyridoxol 5'-phosphate synthase (PdxJ protein), which in combination with 4-(phosphohydroxy-L-threonine dehydrogenase (PdxA protein) catalyzes the formation of vitamin B6 and is expected to be amplified using the recited PCR primers of SEQ ID NOs: 9 and 10. See entire publication, especially pages 45-47.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the recombinant *Escherichia coli* of Zhao et al. such that the *E. coli* nucleic acid encoding 1-deoxy-D-xylulose 5-phosphate synthase taught by Sprenger et al.

Art Unit: 1652

and the *E. coli* nucleic acid encoding pyridoxol 5'-phosphate synthase taught by Laber et al. are transformed and overexpressed in the recombinant *Escherichia coli* of Zhao et al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to have a recombinant *Escherichia coli* that can overproduce Vitamin B6 due to the overexpressed and overproduced enzymes within the modified recombinant *Escherichia coli* of Zhao et al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have a reasonable expectation of success because the art of molecular biology and recombinant manipulations of *E. coli* host cells are well known and developed.

4. Claims 3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao et al. in view of the combined teachings of Sprenger et al. and Laber et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yang et al. (J Bacteriol. 1998 Aug;180(16):4294-9; PTO 892).

Yang et al. teach a process for preparing vitamin B6 comprising culturing recombinant *Escherichia coli* strains having the *epd* gene encoding erythrose 4-phosphate dehydrogenase in LB medium (fermentation broth) containing 1% glycerol and 1% succinate at 37°C for about 24 hours. Yang et al. further teach HPLC chromatography to identify B6 vitamers. See entire publication especially pages 4294-4298, Figs. 1-3, and Tables 1-3.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Yang et al. such that the modified recombinant *Escherichia coli* of Zhao et al. is used in the process for preparing vitamin B6 taught by Yang et al. and the produced vitamin B6 separated from the fermentation broth. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to have a fermentation method that will allow production of large amounts of vitamin B6. Furthermore, it is within the preview of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use and optimize the recited temperature, pH, nutrients, carbon source, nitrogen source, inorganic salts, and culturing conditions in order to facilitate optimal production of vitamin B6.

Conclusion

5. No claim is allowed.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian L Fronda whose telephone number is (571)272-0929. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursdays and alternate Fridays between 9:00AM - 5:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nashaat Nashed can be reached on (571)272-0934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tekchand Saidha/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652